

JUL 05 2006

REMARKS

This reply is submitted in response to the Office Action dated April 4, 2006. Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesy of a telephonic conversation on June 29, 2006 during which the rejections of method claims 22 and 29 based on 35 USC 101 was discussed. In view of those discussions, each independent claim 22 and 29 is amended to include the step of determining one or more symbols transmitted by at least one of the users based on the refined matched-filter detection statistics. Support for the amendments can be found in the original claims, and throughout the remainder of the specification. Thus, no new matter is added. The application is believed to be in condition for allowance.

Allowable Claims

The Office Action Summary indicates that claims 1-21 are allowed, whereas on page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-19 are deemed allowed. As claims 20 and 21 depend on claim 11, it appears that claims 1-21 are in fact allowed. Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the allowance of these claims.

Claim Objections

Claim 29 is objected to due to an informality in line 26 regarding "c*km[r]." This informality has been corrected as noted above.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 101

Claims 22-29 stand rejected as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Although Applicants believe that original independent claims 22 and 29 are directed to statutory subject matter as both recite the step generating a refined matched-filter detection statistic, which amounts to obtaining a tangible result, nonetheless, in order to expedite the prosecution of the application, each of the claims 22 and 29 is amended as noted above to further recite determining one or more symbols transmitted by at least one of the users based on the refined matched-filter statistic.


Accordingly, independent claims 22 and 29, and claims dependent thereon, are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed invention is patentable. Applicant therefore kindly requests reconsideration and allowance of the pending application.

Date: July 5, 2006

Respectfully submitted,



David A. Powsner

Reg. No. 31,868

NUTTER, MCCLENNEN & FISH, LLP

Attorney for Applicant

World Trade Center West

155 Seaport Boulevard

Boston, MA 02110-2604

Tel: (617)439-2000

Fax: (617)310-9000